

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the previous amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 21-33 are currently pending.

On November 10, 2005, the Examiner acknowledged receipt of Applicants October 11, 2005 Amendment and withdrew the Examiners rejections under 35 USC § 112, first and second paragraphs. Since Applicants did not include two terminal disclaimers with its Amendment, the Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 21-33 for reasons of obviousness-type double-patenting. As a result, all claims in this case have been rejected. During a November 15, 2005, telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned counsel, it was discussed that the filing of two terminal disclaimers would obviate the obviousness-type double-patenting rejections. Since Applicants include herewith two terminal disclaimers with this Supplemental Response, Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection.

Applicants' invention is directed to a system for providing an ultrasound image of at least a part of an object or body comprising: an ultrasound imaging apparatus; a kit capable of producing a stabilized microbubble preparation comprising an aqueous medium, a gas osmotic agent, at least one phospholipid surfactant having at least one acyl chain of at least 10 or more carbon atoms and at least a second surfactant, wherein upon the application of energy the phospholipid surrounds the gas osmotic agent to form a microbubble, wherein the gas osmotic agent is selected from the group consisting of perfluorobutane, perfluorocyclobutane, perfluoropentane, perfluorocyclopentane, perfluoromethylcyclobutane, perfluorohexane, perfluorocyclohexane, perfluoromethylcyclopentane, perfluorodimethylcyclobutane, perfluoroheptane, perfluorocycloheptane, perfluoromethylcyclohexane, perfluorodimethylcyclopentane, perfluorotrimethylcyclobutane, perfluoro triethylamine, perfluoropropane and perfluorohexane.

Rejection under obviousness-type double-patenting.

The Examiner has rejected claims 21-33 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting over the claims of U.S. Patents 6,280,705 and 5,798,091. In response to these obviousness-type double-patenting rejections, Applicants

hereby respectfully submit two terminal disclaimers, disclaiming the terminal part of the statutory term of the instant application which would extend beyond these patents. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request this ground for rejection to be withdrawn.

Conclusion.

In view of the foregoing remarks, and accompanying terminal disclaimers, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If allowance of this application may be expedited by resolution of simple issues through a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

On October 11, 2005, Applicants paid \$450.00 for its request of a two-month extension of time. Since this response is being filed within the third month, Applicants should receive a \$450.00 credit towards its \$1,020.00 fee for a request for an additional one-month extension of time. Applicants hereby request a one-month extension of time in which to file this response. Thus, the \$570.00 extension for response within the third month is being made by credit card payment. The required credit card payment form is attached. If any other fees are due, the USPTO is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3329.

Respectfully submitted,

NORTON & DIEHL LLC
77 Brant Avenue
Clark, NJ 07066

Dated: November 15, 2005

By: Gerard P. Norton

GERARD P. NORTON
Reg. No. 36,621
Attorney of Record
(732) 815-0404 (Telephone)
(732) 815-1330 (Facsimile)